

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700274

A. List of Restoration Activities

This restoration project is intended to stop and reverse harmful effects caused by inappropriate vehicle traffic in closed areas and wilderness. In addition to installing physical barriers, inappropriate routes would be physically restored using common techniques. This is a relatively pristine eco-system which is slowly beginning to degrade from inappropriate OHV traffic. Our main goal is to stop this pattern and restore the natural systems to their pre-disturbed condition; then prevent future negative impacts.

1. Field-verify, and, with resource surveys, precision 'fine-tune' as needed to identify barrier installation sites that would have the effect intended.
2. Site-by-site, determine the most effective type of barrier (e.g., boulder, post & cable, etc.)
3. Provide for barrier installation services under contract(s).
4. Provide for effective, accountable oversight of such contract(s).
5. Complete route restoration to remove visible traces of illegal routes past barriers.
6. Monitor post-construction OHV use of the area; patrol for violations.

B. How the Proposed Project Relates to OHV Recreation

The proposed Project would promote responsible OHV Recreation, along routes of travel designated open, by substantially reducing the probabilities of unintentional intrusion(s), into wilderness, by motor vehicle operators (motorcycle, ATV & 4WD). In addition to providing physical barriers to off route travel, the restoration work would camouflage traces of inappropriate travel effectively removing the visual temptation.

C. Size of Project Site

The Project involves a 3.5 mile segment (est.) of motor vehicle corridor in Rattlesnake Canyon, federal wilderness ("Bighorn Mountain") being on both sides of the corridor. Of a total of nine (9) barrier sites proposed, eight (8) are distributed along that segment. One (1) of those eight is on the southwest edge, and the other seven (7) are spaced unevenly along the northeast edge. Typically, though not in every case, these are sites where side drainage flow lines intersect the main flow line of the Canyon.

D. Monitoring and Methodology

Monitoring: Regularly, BLM staff and/or appropriate volunteers would 1) visit the site of each protective barrier installed as proposed in this application, 2) assess, in writing, the management circumstances at those sites, 3) draft separate, written recommendations as to further needs for action (e.g., maintenance), 4) transmit such recommendations to appropriate BLM officials for decision and direction; and 5) have contact with visitors to the area, providing information and possibly issuing citations for violations.

E. List of Reports

F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews

G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area

See D above. Additionally, the applicant would 1) continue to deploy law enforcement patrol(s) in the Rattlesnake Canyon segment at issue, and 2) continue to install and maintain wilderness boundary markers in that segment, adjusting to ongoing circumstances so as to sustain reasonable public notice of the presence of wilderness.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700274

1. Project-Specific Maps

Attachments:

[Rattlesnake Canyon Project Site Map](#)

2. Project-Specific Photos

Attachments:

[Rattlesnake pic 1; typical barrier site](#)

[Rattlesnake pic 2; unsigned egress](#)

[Rattlesnake pic 3; legal route lacks signs](#)

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
Agency: BLM - Barstow Field Office
Application: Rattlesnake Protective Barrier Restoration

6/2/2009

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		Version # _____	APP # _____
APPLICANT NAME :	BLM - Barstow Field Office		
PROJECT TITLE :	Rattlesnake Protective Barrier Restoration	PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :	
PROJECT TYPE :	<div style="display: flex; flex-wrap: wrap;"> <div style="width: 50%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition</div> <div style="width: 50%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Development</div> <div style="width: 50%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety</div> <div style="width: 50%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations</div> <div style="width: 50%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement</div> <div style="width: 50%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Planning</div> <div style="width: 50%;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restoration</div> </div>		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	<p>This restoration project is intended to stop and reverse harmful effects caused by inappropriate vehicle traffic in closed areas and wilderness. In addition to installing physical barriers, inappropriate routes would be physically restored using common techniques. This is a relatively pristine eco-system which is slowly beginning to degrade from inappropriate OHV traffic. Our main goal is to stop this pattern and restore the natural systems to their pre-disturbed condition; then prevent future negative impacts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Field-verify, and, with resource surveys, precision 'fine-tune' as needed to identify barrier installation sites that would have the effect intended. 2. Site-by-site, determine the most effective type of barrier (e.g., boulder, post & cable, etc.) 3. Provide for barrier installation services under contract(s). 4. Provide for effective, accountable oversight of such contract(s). 5. Complete route restoration to remove visible traces of illegal routes past barriers. 6. Monitor post-construction OHV use of the area; patrol for violations. 		

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	Staff						
	Recreation Planner	400.000	53.000	HRS	0.00	21,200.00	21,200.00
	Park Ranger	200.000	28.000	HRS	5,600.00	0.00	5,600.00
	Other-Maintenance Worker	400.000	38.000	HRS	15,200.00	0.00	15,200.00
	Other-Wilderness Coordinator	200.000	50.000	HRS	0.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
	Total for Staff				20,800.00	31,200.00	52,000.00
2	Contracts						
	Other-Large boulders	1.000	40000.000	MISC	40,000.00	0.00	40,000.00
	Other-Small crane	1.000	20000.000	MISC	20,000.00	0.00	20,000.00
	Total for Contracts				60,000.00	0.00	60,000.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
Agency: BLM - Barstow Field Office
Application: Rattlesnake Protective Barrier Restoration

6/2/2009

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
3	Materials / Supplies						
	Route Markers	200.000	24.000	EA	0.00	4,800.00	4,800.00
4	Equipment Use Expenses						
5	Equipment Purchases						
6	Others						
7	Administrative Costs						
	Administrative Costs-Manager	100.000	65.000	HRS	0.00	6,500.00	6,500.00
	Administrative Costs-Budget/Procurement	100.000	40.000	HRS	0.00	4,000.00	4,000.00
	Total for Administrative Costs				0.00	10,500.00	10,500.00
Total Program Expenses					80,800.00	46,500.00	127,300.00
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES					80,800.00	46,500.00	127,300.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					80,800.00	46,500.00	127,300.00

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
 Agency: BLM - Barstow Field Office
 Application: Rattlesnake Protective Barrier Restoration

6/2/2009

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	20,800.00	31,200.00	52,000.00	
2	Contracts	60,000.00	0.00	60,000.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	0.00	4,800.00	4,800.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	0.00	0.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Administrative Costs	0.00	10,500.00	10,500.00	
Total Program Expenses		80,800.00	46,500.00	127,300.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		80,800.00	46,500.00	127,300.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		80,800.00	46,500.00	127,300.00	

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700274

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
(Please select Yes or No)

ITEM 2

- b. ITEM 2 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ☒ Yes ☐ No
(Please select Yes or No)
- c. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- d. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 3 – 9

ITEM 3 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

This project would have no impacts on wetlands or navigable waters because there are none in the Rattlesnake Canyon Project Area. Neither would this project likely have any impacts to sensitive habitats or species because the work is designed to avoid such impacts. This is a relatively minor project with minimal surface disturbance. Our environmental review process concluded this project would not impact sensitive habitats or species. However, this project is located on the edge of known Big Horn Sheep habitat, and individuals could potentially be found in the project area. Yet this is a one-time restoration project that is intended to improve the quality of habitat for all species in the affected area. Construction would pose temporary transient impacts from noise, movement and sound associated with implementation. These are all minor and temporary impacts that would be replaced with permanent barriers and improved habitat from restoration work. Because the work is temporary in nature individuals could easily avoid active work areas.

ITEM 4 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

The major anticipated cumulative impact should be a change in visitor traffic patterns in Rattlesnake Canyon because the new barriers would stop un-authorized motorized intrusions into wilderness. This project would have nominal harmful cumulative impacts because it does not affect staging areas or legal riding opportunities, and therefore it is very unlikely to displace use. The project intent is to provide significant beneficial results to sensitive desert resources in wilderness because it would help stop future harmful motorized intrusions. The most significant positive long term cumulative impact is the prevention of a new quasi-open area and the avoidance of new OHV trails. This project both protects wilderness & sensitive desert resources, while sending a strong management message that OHV use is not appropriate or allowed here.

ITEM 5 - Soil Impacts

The proposed activities of installing the barriers will have nominal negative impacts on the environment because of steep slopes or highly erosive soils. Project equipment and work activities are limited to the area adjacent to the designated open route. Furthermore, the proposed activities will provide moderate positive effects for the environment by stopping illegal use of motorized vehicles on steep slopes in wilderness. Currently OHV riders are leaving the designated open route through the canyon and riding up un-authorized side trails on steep slopes. These illegal routes are non-sustainable and cause the formation of new gullies. This is resulting in increased soil loss and sedimentation loads in Rattlesnake Canyon drainage.

ITEM 6 - Damage to Scenic Resources

There would be no damage to scenic resources within the viewshed of an official state scenic highway because there are no designated scenic highways near Rattlesnake Canyon.

ITEM 7 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 8 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the potential impacts and for any substantially adverse changes in the significance of historical or cultural resources and measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the impacts.

ITEM 9 - Indirect Significant Impacts

No indirect significant impacts are anticipated or have been identified in either the original wilderness boundary programmatic EA, or our more recent site specific environmental review and related determination of nepa adequacy. The response to this issue is basically the same as above for direct cumulative impacts. This project is in a remote area and would only affect through riders that are currently exploring illegal routes. The longer we ignore this use the harder it will be to stop in the future. However, because this project addresses illegal activity fairly narrow in scope, it is unlikely to result in unforeseen or adverse indirect impacts.

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Attachments:

[Rattlesnake Determination of Nepa Adequacy](#)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700274

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 76% or more (10 points)
☐ 51% - 75% (5 points)
☒ 26% - 50% (3 points)
☐ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 11

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Domestic water supply (4 points)
☐ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points)
☒ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)
☒ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)
☒ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [2]
☐ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species
☒ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species [2]

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

- c. The watercourse through Rattlesnake Canyon is impacted from multiple routes because of no signs, barriers, maps or kiosk.
d. There is accelerated erosion in the canyon from hillclimbs and multiple illegal routes.
e. Two sensitive areas are impacted, Bighorn Wilderness, Rattlesnake Canyon riparian.
f. Two special status species are impacted.

3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)
☒ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
☐ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
☐ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
☐ Management decision (1 point)
☐ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
☐ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

CDCA Plan (1980, as amended, pp. 83, 85, 87, 91).

4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 10

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- ☒ Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- ☒ Use of native plants and materials
- ☒ Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- ☒ Educational signage
- ☐ Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

- a. L.E. and Park Rangers will be assigned to patrol the canyon on a regular but intermittent basis.
- b. Barriers will primarily consist of native boulders to control traffic, also select sites for post and cable.
- c. Hillclimbs and closed routes are restored using vertical mulching, native plants and materials.
- d. We apply best management practices from planning to implementation, collaboration, interpretation, and use of native materials.
- e. This project includes new site info panels with messages about potential resource conflicts and rider etiquette.

5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

California Desert Conservation Area 1980 plan as amended by West Mojave Plan Amendments.

6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Applicant's operational budget (5 points)
- ☐ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)
- ☐ Other Grant funding (2 points)
- ☐ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

Barstow Field Office 2010 Appropriations Budget

7. Public Input - Q 7.

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)
- ☐ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
- ☒ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

- a. This project includes input from public OHV Leadership meeting at BLM CDD Office.
- c. This project incorporates comments from stakeholders at meetings, open to the public, with the Wilderness Leaders Mtg, (sponsored by California Wilderness Coalition) at the BLM CDD Office.

8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 2

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 4 or more (4 points) ☒ 2 to 3 (2 points)
☐ 1 (1 point) ☐ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

RIAC (Range Improvement Advisory Council)
Sierra Club (Mojave Chapter)
Wilderness Coalition

9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.

9. Scientific and cultural studies will

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)
☐ Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)
☐ Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)
☐ Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

There are 2 primary underlying problems, both addressed by this project. First, the legal route is not identified, signed or explained. This is resolved by identifying route with markers, and large egress structures. Second, visitors are traveling off the approved route because there are no barriers to stop them. This is solved with boulder barriers and post and cable fencing.

11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)
☐ 1 – 10 acres (3 points)
☐ Less than 1 acre (1 points)
☐ No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)